UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/591,455 | 01/18/2007 | Hideo Aoki | 295958US0PCT | 2326 |
| 22850 7590 06/24/2008 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | MAKSYMONKO, JOHN M | |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1796 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/24/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Comments | 10/591,455 | AOKI ET AL. | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | John M. Maksymonko | 1796 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | |
| | -· action is non-final. | | | | |
| , | ,— | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| dissect in assertation with the practice and in E. | x parte quayre, 1000 0.D. 11, 10 | 0.0.210. | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the o | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See | 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20061201. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application Other: | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/591,455 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kakeda et al. (WO 02/092696, using US 7,282,535 as a translation).

Regarding claims 1-4 and 6-7, Kakeda discloses a thermoplastic resin composition (Abstract) comprising:

a polylactic acid polymer (A) (Column 7, Lines 12-13);

an acrylic polymer (B) containing a methyl methacrylate monomer unit (Column 12, Line 50) wherein the compositional ratio of the polylactic acid polymer (A) to the acrylic polymer (B) is within the range of from I / 99 to 99 / 1 (Column 7, Lines 30-34); and

a graft copolymer (C) obtained by graft-polymerizing a vinyl monomer onto a rubbery polymer using a silicone rubber containing a polyorganosiloxane or an acrylic rubber containing a polyalkyl (meth)acrylate rubber as the rubbery polymer (Column 30, Lines 50-51 and Column 31, Lines 47-50), wherein 1 to 50 parts by mass of the graft

copolymer (C) to 100 parts by mass of the total of the polylactic acid polymer (A) and the acrylic polymer (B) is blended (Column 31, Lines 66-67).

Regarding limitations recited in claims 1 and 6-7 which are directed to specific properties of a material recited in said claims, it is noted that once a thermoplastic resin is disclosed to comprise a material as recited in said claim, it will, absent an objective showing to the contrary, inherently display recited properties. See MPEP 2112.

Regarding the method limitations recited in claims 1 and 4 the examiner notes that even though a product-by-process is defined by the process steps by which the product is made, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). As the court stated in Thorpe, 777 F.2d at 697, 227 USPQ at 966 (The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. In re Pilkington, 411 F.2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147 (CCPA 1969). If the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.).

Regarding claim 5, Kakeda discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 as set forth above. Additionally, the reference discloses a molded article obtained by molding the thermoplastic resin composition (Column 33, Lines 10-14).

Regarding the method limitations recited in claim 5 the examiner notes that even though a product-by-process is defined by the process steps by which the product is made, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). As the court stated in Thorpe, 777 F.2d at

Application/Control Number: 10/591,455 Page 4

Art Unit: 1796

697, 227 USPQ at 966 (The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. In re Pilkington, 411 F.2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147 (CCPA 1969). If the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.).

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Maksymonko whose telephone number is (571)270-3239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00AM-4:30PM, and alternating Fridays 7:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/591,455 Page 5

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JM 18 June 2008

/Randy Gulakowski/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796